

**Remarks**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claim 58 in view of the following remarks. Currently, claims 13, 15, 24, 30-32, 34, 35, 46, 47, and 58 are pending. Claims 13, 15, 24, 30-32, 34, 35, 46, and 47 are allowed. Claim 58 was rejected by the Office Action.

Claim 58 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Kuhn et al. in view of Luhman and Higgins. Claim 58 recites a tape dispenser that includes a controller for coordinating actuation of a chad remover, a servo motor and a rewind motor. The controller stops movement of the tape by de-activating the servo motor and brings the chad remover into contact with the tape. The controller maintains operation of the rewind motor while the tape is stopped to maintain tension in the tape as the chad is removed.

Claim 58 includes features that are not shown or suggested by the references. As Applicant's attorney, Ken Smith, pointed out during a telephone interview with Examiner Melvin C. Mayes on October 4, 2004, the references do not show or suggest a controller that maintains operation of the rewind motor while the tape is stopped as is required by claim 58. Claim 58 is in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, claims 13, 15, 24, 30-32, 34, 35, 46, 47, and 58 are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 4, 2004

Ken Smith

Reg. No.: 45,115

Telephone: 216-241-6700

Fax: 216-241-8151